STAT
Declassified in Part - Sanitized Copy Approved for Release @ 50-Yr 2014/03/12 :
CIA-RDP61-00357R000200140009-6

In addition to Miss Berg, the living members are:

Bernie Bierman, football coach; Tommy Gibbons, boxer; Frank "Moose" Goheen, hockey player; Bronko Nagurski and Johnny McGovern, football players; George Mikan, basketball player; Fortune Gordien, discus thrower; Jimmy Johnston, former national amateur golf champion; Tommy Milton, auto racer; and Walter Hoover, onetime sculling champion.

Deceased members are Chief Bender, baseball pitcher, who was born on a Minnesota Indian reservation; Pudge Heffelfinger, Minnesota-born football player; Bob Dunbar, curler; Mike Gibbons and Mike O'Dowd, boxers; and Dr. Henry L. Williams, former Minnesota football coach.

INCREASED EQUIPMENT MAINTENANCE ALLOWANCE FOR RURAL CARRIERS

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 3050) to increase the equipment maintenance allowance for rural carriers, and for other purposes, which was, on, page 1, line 8, strike out "11" and insert "10."

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, the amendment of the House of Representatives to Senate bill 3050 is minor in character, but I should like to explain it. The matter has been cleared by both sides.

As passed by the Senate, the bill would have increased the mileage allowance for rural carriers to 11 cents a mile. The House amended it to 10 cents a mile, resulting in a saving of approximately $5,300,000.

I have talked with members of the committee. The matter has been cleared for action on the Senate floor.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement explaining the bill as amended be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR JOHNSTON OF SOUTH CAROLINA

ILLEGIB March 31, 1958, the Senate passed S. 3050, to increase the equipment maintenance allowance for rural carriers. As passed in the Senate, the bill would have increased their mileage allowance from 9 cents to 11 cents and fixed, for the first time, a minimum daily allowance.

Yesterday, the bill was passed in the House with one amendment. The amendment reduced the mileage allowance from 11 cents to 10 cents. The chairman of the House committee introduced a letter from Ray L. Hulick, president of the National Rural Letter Carriers Association, dated May 1, 1958, indicating this reduction meets with the full approval of his association. Also introduced was a letter from the Postmaster General indicating approval of the action.

In view of this, I think the Senate has no alternative but to recede from its position and accept the bill as passed by the House. The bill as passed in the Senate would have cost $11,200,000 as against the House bill which will cost $5,900,000 annually.

As can be seen, this action on the part of the House reduces payments that will go to rural carriers by some $5,300,000 a year.

I wish to commend Senators YARBOROUGH and PROXMIRE, who sponsored S. 3050, for their perseverance in behalf of this greatly needed legislation. I regret, and I am sure they do, too, that the bill was not approved in its original form, as I believe the more liberal allowance contained in the Senate bill was completely justified. However, under the circumstances, we have no further choice in the matter at this time.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House of Representatives.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from South Carolina.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I may say that some of the members of the committee felt that the Senate was right, but, under the circumstances, we thought it best to accept the amendment of the House.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, in passing today S. 3050, a bill to increase the equipment maintenance allowance paid rural letter carriers, the Senate has acted to correct a financial injustice which has been suffered by this group of postal employees.

It was my pleasure to sponsor this merited legislation, together with my colleague, the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE]. The subcommittee, headed by the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], and the full Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, under the able leadership of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], deserve words of praise for expediting consideration of this legislation.

The National Rural Letter Carriers' Association, representing the Nation's rural carriers, also deserve credit for their untiring efforts in presenting factual data which substantiated the urgent need for enactment.

S. 3050, as passed, is not as liberal in its provisions as the original bill. It does, however, represent a compromise which we did work out in order not further to delay action. The compromise accepted today should assure this proposal becoming a law in the very near future.

STUDY OF SPACE AND ASTRONAUTICS

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, under the leadership of the distinguished majority leader, Senator LYNDON JOHNSON, of Texas, there has been a meeting of the Senate Special Committee on Space and Astronautics, of which he is the chairman, to hear Dr. James Doolittle, who is vice president of the Shell Oil Co. and chairman of the National Advisory Committee on Aeronautics, in conjunction with Senate bill 3609.

This marks the beginning, as far as the Senate is concerned, of hearings which can be of enormous importance to the United States. Without attempting to go into details, I can surely say that some of us who have been serving on the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy are extremely interested in the hearings and the conclusions which the Congress and the country will finally reach. We have been attracted to the possibilities of space flight and to the possibility that manned vehicles can travel between the Earth and the Moon, Mars, and Venus, and the possibilities of interplanetary and interstellar travel are extremely attractive. We have had much testimony to the effect that a manned flight back and forth between the Earth and Mars, for example, can only be possible through the medium of nuclear propulsion, and we, therefore, have an extremely alert interest in who shall direct the research looking toward that eventuality.

As I shall probably say many times during the hearings, it is strange that the bill recommended by the President makes no mention whatever of nuclear propulsion. That fact alone will cause a great many people to stop and wonder whether we will orient our course toward ultimate success or certain failure. Once the hearings start, I hope to give undivided attention to that question. Therefore, I thought it might be well, on the opening of the hearings, to say a few words about previous problems, and specifically the problems of the bill which came from the Bureau of the Budget, in order that some of the points I raise may be in the minds of the members of the committee as they examine the testimony of Dr. Doolittle and those who will follow him on the witness stand.

On October 4, 1957, our illusion of scientific superiority was shattered, and the advent of the space age found us without policy or program. As a nation, we did much soul searching, and found that our own space exploration programs had been treated lightly at the highest levels, while the Soviets had been engaged in longtime planning and programing.

As early as 1955, the Soviet Union had established a Commission on Astronautics with specific responsibilities and power to direct scientific laboratories and research centers to work on outer space development. They had a program. They seemed to know where they were going. Now, almost 4 years after the founding of the Soviet Space Agency, the President has forwarded a message and a legislative proposal for the beginning of an astronautical program in the United States.

The proposal calls for the creation of a new outer space agency built around the present National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics. The Congress has responded promptly, and is now holding hearings. Of course, much more could have been done in these 8 months and earlier, under existing law, but this is now somewhat irrelevant.

In approaching outer-space legislation, we must first examine the reasons why and explain to ourselves and the public the need for appropriating funds for the development of satellites, space vehicles, and the later exploration of outer space. To date many reasons have been proffered, but I have seen few concise explanations.

The reason why is a dynamic composite of many things, all of which surround our destiny as a leader among nations.

The primary reason why we must have an astronautical program is to explore the vast unknowns of the universe and harvest its scientific information. The material value of such knowledge is dif-

Declassified in Part - Sanitized Copy Approved for Release @ 50-Yr 2014/03/12 :
CIA-RDP61-00357R000200140009-6

Declassified in Part - Sanitized Copy Approved for Release @ 50-Yr 2014/03/12 : CIA-RDP61-00357R000200140009-6

ficult to measure, but we have learned over the centuries that knowledge once applied to practical usage pays dividends a millionfold. When Dr. Einstein wrote to President Roosevelt and suggested what was to become the atom-bomb program, who would have anticipated today's widespread industrial and medical use of isotopes, atomic power, or ships that can sail the oceans for years on their original charge of fuel?

An outer-space program offers us much knowledge in meteorology, biology, and astronomy, and within these and the many sciences there is much we will learn. In a more material sense, man would learn about the resources on the moon and the planets with a view toward their use after we have exploited the scarce resources of this world. This much is certain, exploration of outer space will afford us the priceless opportunity of looking at our own planet in a detached but highly advantageous position—a position man has long dreamed about and now finds within his grasp.

We should also have a program for purely military reasons. Some have said that the planet could be controlled, in military terms, from outer space, but this may be an overstatement. The weight of opinion is that the main military value of satellites or space vehicles would be in reconnaissance. When we remember that the allied armies stopped before Monte Casino for 5 months because a single reconnaissance point supported the enemy forces, we can assess the magnitude. A reconnaissance point in space could monitor the positions of armies, aircraft, shipping and particularly the position of all missile launching and storage sites on Earth.

Recently the President's Scientific Advisory Committee, whose chairman is Dr. Killian, published a report entitled, "Introduction to Outer Space." This report spoke of the military applications of space technology in the same terms of communications and reconnaissance but it minimized the risk of actual bombardment from outer space. Since then Dr. Werner von Braun has taken issue with the report, stating that actual bombardment of the Earth is quite conceivable from space satellites and vehicles. We might well add then, another military usage—that of strategic bombardment.

But we have learned with our atom and hydrogen bombs that the possession of a highly advanced weapon system alone does not assure the peace. To plan the usage of outer space for military advantage alone merely broadens the armament race and emphasizes preparatio for war. But, the Science of Astronautics offers much more. It can be an avenue to peace and international accord. Here the major powers of the world might work together, and plan joint scientific ventures. There is an esoteric quality to outer space exploration and once man's mind is lifted from his own planet and into the universe, he might well forget his hatreds and work for human knowledge and understanding.

These are the reasons why we should promote the science of astronautics in the United States and have a national program.

The Congress now must decide what kind of a program there will be—whether it will truly be under civilian or military control—its size and scope—and what policy will be set to guide the executive branch.

The President has proposed a civilian agency and is to be congratulated for his enlightened approach. His concept should be accepted, for the arguments in favor of real civilian control, particularly if we are to consider this work as an avenue to peace, are indeed strong. But the mere calling for a civilian agency is not enough, because in practice, the military could dominate this field if we do not spell out the scope and power of the civilian jurisdiction.

I understand that following the President's decision in favor of a civilian control, the Bureau of the Budget was asked to prepare draft legislation embodying his concepts. This legislation was prepared and forwarded to the Congress but there is substantial conflict between the President's purposes and the draft received by the Congress.

I need not remind Senators how many times the Congress has rejected the exact wording of drafts prepared by attorneys in the executive branch and referred to appropriate committees along with the Presidential messages. Surely no one would look upon our failure to do so now, if indeed we do revise the Bureau of the Budget bill, as evidence of discord on this subject.

In fact, the same situation prevailed with the Atomic Energy Act of 1954. The Congress and the Executive were of the same political party then, and there was an intimate working relationship on atomic energy matters. When the decision was made to amend the 1946 Atomic Energy Act and permit private industrial participation, attorneys in the executive branch of Government prepared a draft proposal. The then chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, Representative Sterling Cole, decided that this proposal did not spell out the agreed upon objectives and the proposal was discarded. A vastly different draft was prepared in the Congress but it was soon accepted by the Executive as an administration bill.

I believe that the draft outer space bill which the Bureau of the Budget has prepared presents the same problem, and hope that my comments on some defects will be accepted as constructive criticism. To cure these defects, revisions are needed, and perhaps a completely new bill must be written. Specifically, the problems are these:

The Bureau of the Budget tried to modify the existing legislation under which the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics operates and make it into a bill for the Outer Space Agency. But the two concepts of the NACA and the Outer Space Agency are not compatible. They are at variance because the present NACA is essentially a research study and service group. It was created to carry on research for the military aviation branches, for the Civil Aeronautics Authority and in some respects for aircraft manufacturers. The NACA has never worked on or directed a complete project such as building the *Nautilus* or an ICBM. It merely studies a small phase of a project and lends advice to the agencies responsible for the project itself. Hearings by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy revealed that NACA does no hardware development work.

The new agency envisioned in the President's proposal would direct whole projects and use contract powers to a great extent. It would not be simply a study group.

The NACA works through committees. On top of the agency, there is a 17-man committee made up of Government representatives and men from private walks of life. In addition to the main committee, there are many subcommittees, often in excess of 20, which are also composed of industry and Government people, both military and civilian.

In the new agency where important contracts would be awarded, the public interest would seem to reject such ill-defined, comingling of Government representatives and private parties. The appointees from private life would serve without compensation and, despite the utmost discretion in appointments, the potential at one time or other for conflicting interests surely seems great.

In this regard, I am most distressed by one provision of the Bureau of the Budget bill. While the bill incorporates NACA into the new agency, the present NACA law, providing for a 17-member committee of which 10 are appointed from the Government and 7 serve without compensation from private life, was changed. In modifying this law the Bureau of the Budget attorneys reversed the representations and chose to have 9 persons, the majority of the committee from private life, and only 8 from the Government. We find, then, that the Bureau of the Budget not only failed to be concerned over the comingling of private and Government persons in an agency with the power to contract on specific projects but they also—and obviously with deliberation—placed the majority control of the agency in the hands of private persons. They would divest the Government of control over the most dynamic program of this century.

I believe that these draftsmen from the Bureau of the Budget should be called before a committee of Congress to explain why they deliberately chose to change this provision.

At the same time I would like to hear why their bill makes provisions for the acceptance of gifts by the agency from private sources.

I do not mean to impugn the integrity of the Bureau of the Budget representatives nor suggest improper motives. I believe, however, that explanation of their thinking could help the Congress understand why the jurisdiction over outer-space matters should not be controlled by appointed Government officials, confirmed by the Senate, rather than by private parties.

Even if there were not his odious characteristic of private control, I would be

Declassified in Part - Sanitized Copy Approved for Release @ 50-Yr 2014/03/12 : CIA-RDP61-00357R000200140009-6

Declassified in Part - Sanitized Copy Approved for Release @ 50-Yr 2014/03/12 : CIA-RDP61-00357R000200140009-6

at a loss to understand how 17 men can be truly responsible for the conduct of such vital work. While it is true that the Bureau of the Budget bill has the 17-man committee deciding upon only 4 subjects, these 4 topics go to the very root of the Agency's affairs. The 17-man Board would have referred to them all policy, program, budget, organization, and major personnel matters. With that much power of decision, they obviously would control the Agency.

One of the major problems in the United States in our advanced scientific and technical programs has been our inability to fix responsibility for success or failure of projects. Only in programs such as Admiral Rickover's work on the nuclear Navy has the Government been able to pinpoint responsibility. We have a broad body of experience to teach us that if we are to launch successfully large-size satellites and space vehicles and to explore outer space, the Agency we create should be constituted in such a way that someone is responsible.

Many experts have testified on the use of atomic power for launching and propelling space vehicles. The evidence seems overwhelming that any vehicle of substantial size and range must depend upon some form of nuclear energy as its propulsive force. If we contemplate the ability to maneuver in outer space or have round-trip explorations of the moon and other planets, nuclear energy must play a part. In terms of launching vehicles, thrusts of over 1 million pounds suggest the use of nuclear power. Soviet technical authors have not ignored this prospect and most recent works discuss the uses of nuclear power on space flight.

We should not delude ourselves that we have anything to hide from the Soviets, for they are obviously many years ahead. Recently I was examining an interesting little booklet entitled "Application of Atomic Engines in Aviation." It was published last November by the military press of the Ministry of Defense of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and has recently been translated by the Air Force.

On page 166 of this booklet there is an interesting passage regarding the relative desirability of nuclear and chemical fuels for the propulsion of interplanetary vehicles:

> At present, thanks to the progress made in nuclear physics, to the development of a rapidly progressing science of atom power, and to the creation of an atomic industry, we have come close to the solution of the problem of making use of atomic energy in rocket engineering.
>
> However, even today, many scientists believe that the first interplanetary trip by man will not be made with nuclear but with conventional chemical fuel. Another and in fact, much larger group of contemporaries hold that interplanetary flights are impossible with conventional chemical fuel and that a more powerful source of energy such as nuclear energy would have to be used.

Then if one turns to page 179 of this Russian booklet under the heading of "Conclusions," he will find this interesting passage:

> The question as to the necessity and possibility of applying atomic energy in aviation has already been given a positive answer and solution. This is primarily demonstrated in the directives of the 20th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, which indicate the need to develop atomic engines for transport purposes.

I do not think that there can be much doubt that the Soviet Union is going ahead full blast with the development of nuclear propulsion for space rockets. The material in this little booklet leaves very little doubt on that score.

Despite such evidence, not enough is being done in this country to develop the technology of nuclear power application. For several years now, there has been a modest program for the application of nuclear power to military missiles, but the program has been so impeded by budget limitations it cannot test promising ideas. Dr. Norris G. Bradbury, director of the Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory, has to cook his pot too far back on the stove.

Within the atomic energy program, there are major Government laboratories employing some of the best scientific and engineering talent in the land—men deeply dedicated to the public good. Less than 1 percent of all these scientists and engineers have even had the opportunity to study the role of nuclear power as applied to missiles, much less outer space. Few have even had access to the technical information on nuclear missile work. We may feel certain the Soviet atomic scientists and engineers have not been denied this opportunity, particularly when we consider that the Soviet Commission on Astronautics can place requirements on such laboratories as it chooses.

And yet, between the time of the Soviet sputnik and now, no one, outside the Congress, has called upon the Atomic Energy Commission to increase its effort, and no requirements have been placed upon them to conduct broad studies on outer space propulsion. The President's bill and message are completely silent on atomic power and it may be that little thought has been given to the subject.

Of course, no new legislation is needed to start studies of atomic power application now; in fact, by simple administrative order, it could have started yesterday and it could start today. Only modest appropriations would be required because all of the facilities exist and the people are already employed. There would be no expenditures for components or hardware—only for study time. It seems incomprehensible that the order has not been given to start 4 or 5 of the major Government laboratories on broad studies.

On May 1 Dr. James Von Allen at the University of Iowa reported in connection with International Geophysical Year—IGY—research that unidentified forms of radiation might exist in the form of a belt many hundreds of miles outside the earth's atmosphere. Newspaper stories on this suggest that this could prove to be a barrier to manned satellites and a temporary hazard through which space vehicles would have to pass. The discovery does not affect the probability of travel, but the discovery does point up the fact that the laboratories who have the most experience with radiological hazard, those of the Atomic Energy Commission, should be utilized to the utmost in outer space research.

The discovery also emphasizes the desirability of nuclear propulsion because one of the difficulties with nuclear propulsion is the necessity for shielding against radioactivity. If it is necessary to shield a space vehicle against the newly discovered radioactive belt anyway, we might just as well use the most powerful propulsive force we have available. We can well remember as we evaluate this, that the U. S. S. *Nautilus* has inside of it a source of radioactivity which could kill all the ship's occupants in a matter of moments. The laboratories of the Atomic Energy Commission learned how to permit men to live in this environment and, in fact, be free from radiation. The same Atomic Energy Commission laboratories can solve the problem of human health from radioactivity in outer space and from proximity to nuclear propulsion plants on space vehicles.

The Bureau of Budget draft bill is silent on the international aspects of astronautics. The omission is indeed strange when we think of this science as a force for peace and see the ample provision for military representation in the agency. Certainly the Congress will wish to assure itself that there are strong policy and substantive provisions on the subject and assure, at the very minimum, that the Department of State is informed of the activities of the agency so that it can approach international conferences intelligently.

The Bureau of the Budget's legislative proposal contains no section on patents. Its silence leaves patent awards in the hands of the new space agency. Since the Bureau of the Budget's bill provides for the majority of the board controlling the agency to be from private life, one would wonder what thought was given to protecting the Government's interest in the patent rights arising out of contracts for research and development of outer space components. I am sure most members of the Congress remember the many weeks of debate over the patent clauses of the Atomic Energy Act when a few of us insisted upon protecting the public interest in the atomic energy field with appropriate patent provisions. Any legislation the Congress now approves for space should have similar provisions.

At present, the National Advisory Committee on Aeronautics is required to come before Congress and obtain specific authorizing legislation before they can construct new facilities or expand existing ones. When the draftsmen at the Bureau of Budget incorporated the present NACA structure into their bill they deleted this provision.

When we consider that the United States has billions of dollars invested in laboratories and other facilities spread all over the United States, Congress should have the opportunity to see how existing facilities, particularly those at the Atomic Energy Commission and the Department of Defense laboratories, are being utilized before they permit the ex-

Declassified in Part - Sanitized Copy Approved for Release @ 50-Yr 2014/03/12 : CIA-RDP61-00357R000200140009-6

Declassified in Part - Sanitized Copy Approved for Release @ 50-Yr 2014/03/12 : CIA-RDP61-00357R000200140009-6

penditure of funds on new laboratories and plants. I feel certain that Congress will wish to make provision for authorizing legislation in any law on outer space which is enacted.

In 1946 when the first Atomic Energy Act was being considered, there was much controversy over military versus civilian control. The debate ended with a proposal by the late Senator Vandenberg providing for a military liason committee to the Atomic Energy Commission which would keep the military informed of atomic energy progress and through which the military could place requirements upon the Atomic Energy Commission. The wisdom of Senator Vandenberg's compromise has been proven, and the Atomic Energy Commission has more than fulfilled the most optimistic anticipations of the Department of Defense in terms of atomic weapons.

The Vandenberg provision worked, because it distinguished between the domains of the civilian and military agency. Under the Bureau of Budget proposal and within the NACA-type framework, military personnel would be so commingled in the agency that there would be no demarcation between its civilian and military character. This hybrid could be utterly confused in its purposes.

But even more important than this, is the problem of deciding what aspects of outer space should be under civilian control and what should remain within the military. Of late, we hear that most of the funds for space research would still go to military agencies even though a new civilian agency may come into being. For fiscal year 1959, the Budget Bureau had requested $480 million for a military space program and only $100 million for a civilian program. In fact, a one-time Presidential adviser recently stated that if most of the money is to be allocated for military space research, it might be better to just forget about creating a civilian agency. Apparently he thought that talk of a civilian agency in the administration is only so much window dressing to hide the true intention of continuing a purely military program.

Despite the fact that the President has forwarded a message and legislation to Congress, no civilian program has been outlined so far. Discussions to date indicate that under present plans, the bulk of outer space research and development would remain within the Department of Defense. This expectancy is fortified by the April 2 memorandum from the White House to the Department of Defense and the Presidential Advisory Committee on the subject. It said the civilian agency would be responsible for all space programs except those peculiar to or primarily associated with military weapons systems or military operation.

If the words of this memorandum are to supply the demarcation between civilian and military control, it would be a farce to call this a civilian program. So few things in modern life could not be described as peculiar to military operations that if the same test were used in the rest of our national affairs, we would have a military dictatorship.

The military viewpoint had its ultimate expression in the recent testimony of Maj. Gen. Bernard A. Schriever, who said that the development of space weapons must take priority over nonmilitary space exploration, and he inferred that a civilian agency could not supply the military with the weapons systems for outer space that it might need.

Of course, we have all seen that the civilian Atomic Energy Commission has been more than competent in supplying weapons to the military, and many of our international problems of late with hydrogen-bomb tests spring from this very success. One can only suspect that the concern of the Air Force is that with the demise of the Strategic Air Command there will be a lack of billets for its many senior officers, and control over an outer space program would provide them with many hundreds of such billets. This program is so important to the United States that we could well afford to provide fictitious commands for these senior officers and get on with the scientific job.

Mr. Simon Ramo, of the Ramo-Wooldridge Corp., a private company, recently said that 90 percent of the space program of the United States must remain under military control and direction for the security of the Nation. Mr. Ramo's comment is of great interest and might be indicative. Some years ago the Air Force found it lacked the management talent to administer the intercontinental ballistic missile program and assigned management of most of the Government's interest to the Ramo-Wooldridge Corp. The management of missiles has vested in the Ramo-Wooldridge Corp. for some years and the rate of progress and success has been somewhat questionable.

In drafting any new legislation, Congress might want to look at this arrangement, whereby a private company more or less acts as a Government representative, placing contracts for research and development and the procurement of components. I can fully understand why Mr. Ramo would object to a new agency which might exercise some control over the Government's funds and direct the Government's program. I can well understand his fear that before many months passed, he might have to deal with a tight-fisted civilian administrator.

In the enactment of any legislation, the Congress might well look for a proper definition of what should remain in the Defense Department and what should be in the civilian agency. I believe a clear definition is readily available. The Defense Department should retain jurisdiction over missiles which are fired from earth or its atmosphere and return to a target on earth in a ballistic flight. Anything which goes beyond this and into orbit or travels into outer space should go to the new agency. The record of the Department of Defense in developing satellites and mechanisms which go into orbit is hardly a record of success. They would be pressed to make a case that they have such an interest in this field that jurisdiction could not be given to a civilian agency. But even if they had progressed with their research and development we have the classic precedent of the Manhattan Engineering District and the Atomic Energy Commission where a fully matured program was transferred to a civilian agency and progress was accelerated rather than impeded.

I can only suspect that the same Air Force generals who seek larger hydrogen bombs in a period when the United States is being criticized as militaristic in its approach to atomic energy are the same people who are hostile to civilian stewardship of a space program.

I am convinced that no program worthy of the United States can possibly evolve out of the presently confused Pentagon. At the moment they have jurisdiction but we learn that no requirement has been fixed for a space vehicle. As you know, without a requirement, no Government work is being done in this area.

The draft legislation of the Bureau of the Budget provides for the new agency to report to the President annually. This is a strange provision because one would expect the President to be kept informed on what is taking place within his executive family. The channel in which reporting breaks down is between the executive branch and Congress. While it is called upon to appropriate billions of dollars of public money, Congress must often proceed with the scantiest of information. It would have been more thoughtful of the draftsmen to provide some reporting mechanisms to Congress but surely we can arrange in our committees to provide for a semiannual report to us.

The Bureau of the Budget's draft provides criminal penalties for disclosures of information and violation of the Space Agency's security regulations. We have learned that penal provisions of a substantive nature in new laws weaken the basic statutes like the Espionage Act of 1917 and the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 and confuse an already confused field.

In a more positive sense, I think the provision is unwise insofar as it accents security provisions rather than encourages the new agency to conduct its scientific and technical research to the fullest extent practicable in an atmosphere of free information exchange.

In the atomic-energy program we learned that the strongest of security measures and building forts around our laboratories did not halt scientific progress elsewhere in the world. The delusion cost us many millions, if not billions of dollars; and, as I look back upon it, I only wish that this money had been spent on basic research. If it had, the benefits which would have accrued to the United States would have been vast.

Mr. President, I have been generally critical of the legislation which has been sent to us; and, if I were to close at this point, I probably would have offered little of constructive value to guide us in the establishment of an astronautical agency. I may have told too much of what we should not do rather than what we should do.

Our national astronautical program should be far broader than anything con-

Declassified in Part - Sanitized Copy Approved for Release @ 50-Yr 2014/03/12 : CIA-RDP61-00357R000200140009-6

Declassified in Part - Sanitized Copy Approved for Release @ 50-Yr 2014/03/12 : CIA-RDP61-00357R000200140009-6

templated today. I would provide for utilization of any appropriate governmental scientific or research facility through the placing of requirements or work directives by the space agency on the appropriate Government agency.

Within the atomic-energy program, a subject with which I am most familiar, an almost unlimited reservoir of scientific and engineering talent exists. The Atomic Energy Commission probably should not have jurisdiction over the outer space program as such, but the legislation should provide a mechanism whereby the space agency can place requirements on the major laboratory facilities of the AEC.

The Congress should establish the policy that this new agency not build new facilities or laboratories but that they utilize existing facilities to the utmost. They can do this without sacrifice of jurisdiction by placing requirements on existing agencies. If we think this will be difficult to administer, appropriate liaison committees can be established along the lines of those in the atomic energy program which have been so successful.

The space agency itself should start as a small Agency. Whether 1 man should be in charge or whether there is a 3- or a 5-man commission is a matter for further study, but the top leadership should be limited in number of certainly to no more than 5 and preferably to a lesser number. The people on top should be full-time Government administrators confirmed by the Senate and prohibited from having outside interests. If such deprives the Agency of broad technical advice, provision can be made for such scientific advisory committees as is necessary.

Our statement of policy should call for international negotiations which seek international agreement to deny the use of outer space for military purposes and provide for mutual scientific cooperation.

We should seriously consider whether or not it is appropriate to graft the new Agency on to the existing framework of the NACA because of the great variance between what the new Agency must do and the long existing pattern of work in which the NACA is engaged. I feel that an entirely new agency should be established with power to place requirements for scientific study and work upon the NACA rather than work within its structure. Were we to take this approach we would also avoid the conflicts of interest inherent in the NACA committee structure where industry and military personnel are so much in command.

We must study the problem of inventions and discoveries and find language which protects the Government interest and yet equitably awards to inventors the exclusive right to profit from their work.

I am confident that each Member of Congress will take time to study this problem and if we do this, the proper agency structure and policy will evolve. We have learned a great deal in recent years on how and how not to prosecute scientific programs and undoubtedly we will be able to provide for a responsible and effective Government agency which will harness our very great resources in scientific and engineering talent.

When future generations consider the secrets of the universe as commonplace and when the domain of human reason reigns over outer space, many may look back upon this Congress and speak highly of its wisdom. Before many weeks pass, we will have the chance to inaugurate the effort which one day will be a priceless heritage to those yet unborn.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, May 6, 1958, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 1818. An act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to acquire certain lands as an addition to the Fort Frederica National Monument;

S. 2183. An act to amend the act of August 2, 1956 (70 Stat. 940), providing for the establishment of the Virgin Islands National Park, and for other purposes; and

S. 2937. An act to provide equitable treatment for producers participating in the Soil Bank program on the basis of incorrect information furnished by the Government.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, pursuant to the order previously entered, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 35 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned, the adjournment being, under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Wednesday, May 7, 1958, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 6, 1958:

THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA REDEVELOPMENT LAND AGENCY

Richard R. Atkinson, of the District of Columbia, to be a member of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency, for a term of 5 years, effective on and after March 4, 1958, a reappointment.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

Osro Cobb, of Arkansas, to be United States attorney for the eastern district of Arkansas, for a term of 4 years.

Declassified in Part - Sanitized Copy Approved for Release @ 50-Yr 2014/03/12 : CIA-RDP61-00357R000200140009-6